

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated January 29 2003, claims 1-6, 10-15, 19-24, and 28-32 were rejected as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,477,529 (hereinafter, Mousseau). Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate features of dependent claim 7, which was rejected in the Office Action as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Mousseau and Langdren.

Mousseau does not show all the features of claim 1 as amended. For example, Mousseau does not show that an identification of the type of wireless device is transmitted by a wireless device and received by the first server. The Office Action concedes this point when it discusses the obviousness rejection of claim 7. In the Office Action, reliance is placed on U.S. Patent No. 6,115,754 (hereinafter, Landgren) for the obviousness rejection of claim 7. The Office Action relies on the use of the term "User-Agent" in Landgren to show such a feature. A review of publicly available online resources for the term "User-Agent" indicates that "User-Agent" is a specific HTTP request field specified to be a string that is used to identify the software product for the User Agent, which is typically a browser software, being used by the client submitting an HTTP request. On-line resource information (attached) provide supporting information and further indicate that the field may also include version information and may include names and version numbers of other products that form part of the User Agent software. For the most part, the User Agent is commonly used to indicate the type of browser software (e.g., Netscape, Explorer) currently used by a user to transmit HTTP requests. The User-Agent is, therefore, a field in the HTTP protocol having a specified function other than to be an identification of a wireless device type, and as a result, it does not show the claimed feature. Moreover, our review of Landgren indicates that its use of User-Agent (e.g., FIG. 4 of Landgren includes the text "User-Agent: UPgtwy/1.0 libwww/2.14") is consistent with what we have explained. Therefore, Mousseau and Langdren, either individually or in combination, do not anticipate the method defined by claim 1 as amended.

Moreover, the method of claim 1 is not obvious in view of Mousseau because the method provides advantages that Mousseau does not appear to be able to provide. The systems shown in Mousseau are implemented to provide filtering for certain

known handheld viewing devices or platforms . The specification of Mousseau states in the Description of the Preferred Embodiment (emphasis added) that "[i]n the preferred embodiment, the handheld device is a BlackBerry™ or an Inter@ctive Pager manufactured by Research In Motion Limited." Mousseau, column 3, lines 44-46. The method of claim 1 does not have such a limitation since a range of wireless devices or platforms may be suitably served. Furthermore, Mousseau in specifying that it is implemented for specific known handheld devices teaches away from the adaptive filtering of claim 1 as amended. Therefore, Claim 1 is not obvious in view of Mousseau. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 as amended are requested.

Independent claims 10, 19, and 28 have also been amended to incorporate features of claims 16, 25, and 33, respectively. Reconsideration and allowance of independent claims 10, 19, and 28 are also requested for the same reasons as given here for claim 1. Reconsideration of claims 2-6 (depending from claim 1), claims 11-15 (depending from claim 10), claims 20-24 (depending from claim 19), and claims 29-32 (depending from claim 28) are also requested at least because the claims from which they depend are allowable.


Claims 7, 9, 16, 18, 25, 27, 33, and 35 were rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of Mousseau and Landgren. Claims 7, 16, 25, and 33 have been amended to move the feature with respect to the identification of wireless device type to their respective base claims.

Dependent claims 7, 16, 25, and 33 as amended are allowable at least because their respective independent claims (i.e., claims 1, 10, 19, and 28) are allowable. In addition, claims 7, 16, 25, and 33, as amended each recite receiving or transmitting an identification of the wireless communications network type. In the Office Action, it is conceded that Mousseau does not show such a feature and reliance is placed on Landgren to address the deficiencies in Mousseau. The Office Action states "Landgren discloses including an identification of . . . a wireless communications network type (CDPD Network, etc.) (col. 9, line 17 to col. 10, line 24)." Applicant reviewed the cited section of Landgren and found a discussion with respect to CDPD networks, but found no mention of an identification of the type of wireless communications network and no mention of transmitting or receiving such an identification. Accordingly, even the combination of Mousseau and Landgren does not show all the claimed features of claims 7, 16, 25, and 33 as amended.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 7, 16, 25, and 33 is, accordingly, requested. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 9, 18, 27, and 25, at least because of their dependence from claims 7, 16, 25, and 33, respectively, is also requested.

Claims 8, 17, 27, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mousseau in view of Landgren and U.S. Patent No. 6,173,316. Claims 8, 17, 27, and 34 should be allowable at least because the claims from which they depend are allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 8, 17, 27, and 34 are requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that all of the claims as amended are patentable over the cited art and respectfully requests an early indication of allowance.


Pejman Sharifi
Registration No. 45,097
Customer No. 28765
Winston & Strawn
(212) 294-6700